

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-16 stand rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Pat. No. 6,609,050 (Li). Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,275 (Hughes). Reconsideration of the rejections is hereby solicited in view of the following remarks.

Regarding any rejection under §102, it is noted that the test for anticipation is whether all the elements and operational relationships of the rejected claim are found within a single prior art reference. There must not be any differences between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Absence from the reference disclosure of any claim element and/or operational interrelationship negates anticipation under §102.

Claim 1 is directed to a computerized method for training service personnel to service select equipment. Training that may be needed to fulfill a servicing task is identified and available to the service personnel essentially in real time when training is needed to enable the service personnel to properly perform the servicing task, while remaining on-site. Claim 1 recites providing a database for storing training modules for training service personnel to service assemblies of selected equipment. Claim 1 further recites that in the event predefined qualifications for servicing the assembly are unmet by the present qualifications of the service provider, one or more needed training modules are identified that, upon completion by the service personnel, will enable the service personnel to meet the predefined qualifications relative to that assembly. An input/output device is provided for communicating the needed training modules from the database to the input/output device for access by the service personnel set to perform the service.

Li is directed to a computer-based warranty and administration system. Li purports to overcome shortcomings associated with the write-up process for administering vehicle warranty and repair, such as the collection of information by a service advisor from a consumer. Aspects of the write-up may involve initial repair order, dispatching the work to a service technician, communicating progress back to the customer. See Li, column 1, lines 46 through 61. Li's system does not make any

provisions for storing training modules in a database for training service personnel, much less for communicating any needed training modules from the database to an input/output device, as set forth in claim 1.

Li's system does include a user skill determinator module for determining a skill level for the user. However, Li's system fails to teach or suggest communicating training modules that may be needed by the user to overcome repair skill deficiencies. Li himself recognizes that his system is not designed to deliver any training modules. Accordingly, Li's system may recommend that the technician be sent to a training program to learn needed repair skills. See Li, column 3, lines 29 through 30. This is very different and inapposite to the operational relationships recited in claim 1 where the service personnel will receive essentially on real time the needed training modules from the database without having to disengage from the servicing activity, and enroll in and attend a training program, which likely requires that the service personnel travel to another location. These activities could represent a significant delay and cost not only in terms of lost personnel time, but also lost equipment availability for return to service. Li appears to teach away from these aspects of the present invention in that Li merely recommends what is conventionally done when someone lacks a skill. Go back to school! The present invention metaphorically speaking brings the school on the spot to the technician so that the technician can fulfill the servicing task.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Li does not anticipate claim 1 under the statutory standards of § 102. Since each of the dependent claims from independent claim 1 includes the structural and/or operational relationships respectively recited in such independent claim, it is also respectfully submitted that Li also fails to anticipate each of such dependent claims.

In connection with claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that Hughes fails to overcome the deficiencies of Li discussed above. Thus, the Li and Hughes references, singly or in combination, fail to render unpatentable claim 6.

Claim 16 is directed to a computerized system for training service personnel. In part, claim 16 recites a training identifier configured to identify one or more training modules that may be communicated to service personnel with an input/output device to meet predefined qualifications for servicing a given assembly. It is respectfully

submitted that Li does not anticipate independent claim 16 since Li fails to teach or suggest the structural and/or operational relationships respectively recited in claim 16.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the claims pending in this application recites patentable subject matter and it is further submitted that such claims comply with all statutory requirements and thus each of such claims should be allowed.

The applicant appreciates the Examiner's efforts for conducting a thorough examination, and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney if there are any outstanding items that may be resolved via telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Enrique J. Mora, Esquire
Registration No. 36,875
Beusse Brownlee Bowdoin & Wolter, P.A.
390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2500
Orlando, Florida 32801
Telephone: (407) 926-7705
Facsimile: (407) 926-7720